

DECISION RECORD
For
The Proposed La Posa Travel Management Plan
Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-AZ-C020-2013-0003-EA

DECISION

It is my decision to approve the La Posa Travel Management Plan (Appendix H) as attached to the Proposed La Posa Travel Management Environmental Assessment (EA) along with the Proposed Action, Alternative C, as described in the EA.

<i>Inventoried Transport Assets within the Planning Area</i>	
Asset	Definitions
Road	A linear route declared a road by the owner, managed for use by low-clearance vehicles having four or more wheels, and maintained for regular and continuous use.
Primitive Road	A linear route able to be traversed by four-wheel drive or high-clearance vehicles. Primitive roads do not normally meet any BLM road design standards.
Trail	A linear route managed for human-powered, stock, or OHV forms of transportation or for historical or heritage values. Trails are not generally managed for use by four-wheel drive or high clearance vehicles.

Alternative C Mileage Comparison by Designation

		Open*		Limited#		Closed		Total Miles
		Miles	%	Miles	%	Miles	%	
Route Class	Primitive Road	743.96	48.0%	68.49	4.4%	736.15	47.5%	1,548.60
	Road	243.39	93.5%	16.39	6.3%	0.47	0.2%	260.25
	Trail	1.30	24.4%	.15	2.8%	3.87	72.7%	5.32

RATIONALE FOR DECISION

The *La Posa Travel Management Plan* with Alternative C as described in the La Posa EA represents the most suitable means to managing transportation and access on Bureau of Land Management lands in this area. It draws a reasonable balance between strong demands for diverse types of access and the natural resources within the Planning Area that need protection.

The Proposed Alternative (C) focuses on priorities for managing travel and transportation, including:

- Establishing a comprehensive approach to travel and transportation management;
- Minimizing the effects of vehicular use on natural and cultural resources;
- Enhancing visitor access while minimizing user conflicts; and,
- Ensuring public health and safety.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Through formal and extended scoping, including a public meeting, and through public comments received on the preliminary EA, the public has been informed of the planning process and has provided us with valuable input on how the area should be managed to address a wide variety of issues and concerns, such as motorized uses, private land-owner desires, and access for recreational, commercial, authorized, and administrative purposes. This Travel Management Plan addresses the issues and concerns in a way that minimizes conflict and seeks to implement a management framework for an area where very little management existed previously.

MITIGATION

Areas where roads open to wheeled motorized uses (including administrative and authorized uses) could be causing stream channel alteration, erosion, or other natural resource damage, would be improved to mitigate the damage.

Rationale for not selecting:

Alternative A (No Action):

In addition to Presidential Directives issued since 1972 and route surveys for the La Posa Travel Management Project (TMP) project that began in 2003, concerns have been shared by BLM staff and AZGFD members following their field surveys since then to support that cultural and other natural resource damage is ongoing throughout the Planning Area to warrant the need for a TMP.

Alternative B (Access):

Sufficient concerns were noted on the 2,053 routes that were surveyed by the BLM interdisciplinary team and an AZGFD member to show that many of the routes in Alternative B did not receive the management protection that was provided as in Alternative C (the Proposed Action).

	Open*		Limited #		Closed		Total
Alternative	Miles	%	Miles	%	Miles	%	
B-Access	1,253.69	69.1	47.66	2.6	512.82	28.3	1,814.17
C-Proposed	988.65	54.5	85.03	4.7	740.49	40.8	1,814.17

* Includes Mitigate/Open routes.

Includes Mitigate/Limit routes.

The main resource protection offered in Alternative C, over Alternative B, was to cultural, wildlife (including bighorn sheep), sensitive species, tortoise, and desert washes.

Alternative D (Resource Protection):

As an agency BLM is dedicated to the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. The Yuma District is intrinsically aware of the unique non-market values the Planning Area offers to seasonal residents and tourists, and the delicate balance needed to maintain the health and diversity of the natural resources to sustain the strong recreational draw of the public.

It is for the above reasons that Alternative C (Proposed) is the selected Alternative for the La Posa TMP.

APPEALS

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4. If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in the Yuma Field Office, 2555 E. Gila Ridge Road, Yuma, Arizona 85365 within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition (request) pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 2801.10 or 43 CFR 2881.10 for a stay (suspension) of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Authorizing Officer

/s/ John MacDonald

John MacDonald
Field Manager

3/8/2016

Date